



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Romans was derived from the octoviriate of the Sabines. Here it is difficult to accept his conclusions. We have every reason to think that the tribal groups and village communities of Latium developed the city-state system several centuries before the Sabine clans did. The division of labor and specialization of magisterial functions in Latin city-states could not possibly have awaited the development of intricate political organizations in Sabinum. In the face of this patent fact a nicely schematized hypothesis can hardly serve as argument to the contrary.

The chapter on the Etruscan magistracies is excellent and seems to prove that the magistrates of Etruscan cities were usually the *zilax* (a single officer corresponding to the "dictator" of Caere), the *marniu* (corresponding to the *aeditis* of Caere and the *maro* of Umbria), and the *purθne* (=quaestor, perhaps). The author seems to be correct in explaining the dictatorship of cities like Aricia, Lanuvium, and Nomentum as an old Etruscan institution.

Enough has been said to show that the author has brought new material to the discussion of Rome's constitutional forms; also that the discussion must be carried on farther.

TENNEY FRANK

Tendenz, Aufbau und Quellen der Schrift vom Erhabenen. Von HERMANN MUTSCHMANN. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1913. Pp. 113. M. 2.60.

Mutschmann seems to have taken his cue from a footnote in Otto's *Quaestiones selectae ad libellum qui est περὶ νῦνος spectantes*: "Sunt qui Pseudo-Longinum Theodori Gadareni sectatorem fuisse coniecerint, id quod tamen nemo adhuc accuratius studuit demonstrare." He divides his treatment into three parts corresponding to the three elements in the title. In the first (*Tendenz*), he presents the evidence for holding that the author of this treatise was opposed to Caecilius of Calacte in his rhetorical theory and that the contention between them did not grow out of mere whims of personal taste but was due to a difference in point of view such as is found in the case of members of opposing schools.

In the second part (*Aufbau*) he examines the structure of the treatise and shows that the author has mastered his material and arranged it in orderly fashion. He argues that the treatment of *πάθος* was deferred to a separate work because of its great importance and the limitations of space in the present work and that the apparent discrepancy between the summary at the end of the fifteenth chapter and the topics discussed in the preceding chapters is to be removed by making *σύνθεσις τῶν ἐμφερομένων* a subdivision under *μεγαλοφροσύνη* and by regarding the treatment of *αἴξησις* as a part of the digression on Plato and Demosthenes.

In the third part (*Quellen*) he tries to show by comparisons based largely on the *Anonymous Seguerianus* (Cornutus) not only that the author was

a Theodorean but also that he took much of his material directly from Theodorus. This is the part of the work that is most open to criticism. Because of his eagerness to find support for this, his main thesis, Mutschmann occasionally goes astray in his interpretation and sometimes forms conclusions from insufficient evidence. Earlier in the work he emphasizes the fact that undoubtedly we have lost a large mass of rhetorical writings and utters a protest against the tendency in source criticism to attribute everything to the few authors of whom we have some knowledge. He should have applied this same principle with greater rigor to his own discussion of the relation of Pseudo-Longinus to Theodorus, where he sometimes errs in regarding what seems to have been common stock of the rhetoricians of that period as the peculiar property of Theodorus.

The book is of value as a supplement to the work of Otto and H. F. Müller in combating the modern tendency to find in Caecilius the chief, if not the only, source of this treatise. It also contains some points of interest in matters of interpretation, especially in the treatment of the author's motivation of digressions. It leaves something to be desired in the way of a thorough and impartial discussion of the sources of this work.

R. H. TUKEY

WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE

Die lateinische Übersetzung der Didache kritisch und sprachlich untersucht. . . . Von LEO WOHLB. Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, siebenter Band, 1. Heft. Paderborn: Ferd. Schöningh, 1913. M. 6.

This is an admirable study, by a pupil of Schmalz and Heer, of an interesting bit of Latin Christian translation. In 1721, the Benedictine scholar Petz published a fragment of a *Doctrina Apostolorum*—"Viae duae sunt in saeculo, vitae et mortis, lucis et tenebrarum"—from a Melk MS (saec. IX-X). It lay unnoticed till after Bryennios' discovery in 1883 of the Greek text of the *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*; in 1900, it was supplemented by Schlecht's find—the complete Latin version, in a Freising MS. Wohleb here gives us a critical commentary on the text; a very interesting discussion of the vocabulary and style of the work; a new edition, with a Greek original opposite, reconstructed when necessary; an appendix treating the verb *alto* and its compounds; and complete Latin-Greek and Greek-Latin concordances.

There is only internal evidence to date the *Doctrina*; but its Latin is surprisingly good. 'Εν αἰσχύνῃ becomes "cum pudore"; πρὸς τὸ δοῦναι, "ad reddendum; ήλθεν καλέσαι, "uenit ut inuitaret"; κυριότης, "dominica" (nom. pl. neut.); ὑψηλοί, "altiores"; late translators would have been servile. The only bad slip is *suo* for *eius*. Interesting points are: the Egyptian order of the prohibitions in the Decalogue (adultery